

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 are amended. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the remarks set forth hereinbelow.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the first image data reading device" recited in each of these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3 have been amended to change the above feature to "the image data reading device," in compliance with the interpretation given by the Examiner (see page 3 of the Office Action). Thus, such amendments should not give rise to any estoppel. In view of these amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6-13, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,335,760 to Sato (hereinafter Sato) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,534

to Anderson (hereinafter Anderson). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Sato fails to disclose recording display image data produced by a converting device into a first recording medium if conversion of the original image data is determined to be necessary by the converting device (see page 4 of the Office Action).

However, in page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Anderson discloses an enhanced image file including multiple versions of an image at different resolutions that "allows a digital camera to quickly display a version of the captured image on the display without delays related to resizing the original image data to fit the display." The Examiner further asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sato to store image display data in the enhanced image file taught by Anderson in order to "quickly display a version of the image without the need for resizing the original image data the next time the image is displayed."

MPEP § 2143.03 sets forth the following requirements for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to provide a teaching or suggestion of all of the features in the claimed invention. Specifically, the proposed Sato/Anderson combination fails to disclose or suggest converting original image data into display image data if conversion is determined to be necessary based on the size of the original image data and a display size corresponding to a display, as required by independent claims 1 and 12.

Sato discloses an electronic still camera 10, which can be connected to one of a plurality of display devices 22. Sato discloses a particular example where the camera 10 can be connected to one of four types of display devices (types A, B, C, D), each of which includes a different type of liquid crystal display (LCD) 24 with its own maximum permissible resolution. Sato discloses that a CPU 26 in the camera 10 receives information from the display device 22 regarding the LCD's 24 maximum permissible resolution, via input/output terminals 28, in order to determine at what resolution the image will be reproduced on the LCD 24. See Sato at Figs. 14A and 14B; column 4: lines 20-36; and column 6: line 43-column 8: line 59. In

Sato, the CPU 26 performs a method of progressively expanding the compressed image signal stored in the video memory 18 in order to reproduce the image at the maximum permissible resolution. See column 1: lines 44-52

Anderson discloses a digital camera 110, which includes an LCD screen 402 that both generates a live view and allows the user to review previously captured images. Anderson discloses that, while the camera 110 is in capture mode, an enhanced image file 600 (Fig. 5) is created for each captured image as the user takes pictures. This enhanced image file may include the compressed image data, and both thumbnail and scrennail image data specifically for display on the camera's 110 LCD screen 402. Anderson teaches that the enhanced image file 600 enables the digital camera to quickly display images on the LCD screen 402, which the user can use for choosing and reviewing previously captured images. See column 6: line 51 - column 7: line 5.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Anderson's teaching of an enhanced image file 600 only suggests converting a captured image in a format displayable on an internal LCD device in a digital camera. Accordingly, modifying Sato to implement Anderson's enhanced image file 600 would merely result in Sato's camera automatically storing image data in the video

memory 18 as both compressed image data, and image data (scrennail and/or thumbnail) whose resolution is compatible with an LCD display built into the camera. In this proposed Sato/Anderson combination, it would not be necessary to determine whether conversion of the image data is necessary -- such conversion would automatically be performed. Since the resolution of a built-in LCD device would already be known, there would be no need to implement a converting device in the camera to determine whether conversion is necessary based on the display size.

Furthermore, Sato's CPU 26 makes a determination of the maximum permissible resolution of the LCD 24 of the external display device 22 only because Sato's camera 10 can be connected to multiple types of external display devices 22. Therefore, the CPU 26 in Sato does not know *a priori* the maximum resolution to which the compressed image data should be expanded to reproduce the image. Such determination would not be necessary to generate an enhanced image file, which stores the scrennail and/or thumbnail image based on a resolution that is known *a priori* (i.e., the resolution of a built-in display).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's proposed combination of Sato and Anderson fails to disclose recording image data, which is converted from original image

data when such conversion is determined to be necessary based on a display size corresponding to a display, as required by the independent claims. Thus, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prime face* case of obvious in relation to claims 1, 2, 6-13, and 15-20. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Anderson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,151,730 to Nagasaki et al. (hereinafter Nagasaki). Applicants respectfully submits that Nagasaki fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sato and Anderson set forth above in connection with independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 14 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claims 1 and 12. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Anderson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,067,029 to Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi). Applicant respectfully submits that Takahashi fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sato and Anderson described above in connection with independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 4 and 5 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error, in which "into" has been changed to "onto" in line 14 of the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is merely editorial in nature.

Entry of this Amendment After Final is respectfully requested in that it raises no new issues. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made with respect to the antecedent basis do not raise new issues because they do not materially affect the interpretation of the claims applied by the Examiner during examination. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the editorial amendment to claim 1 (discussed above) does not raise any new issues because it merely relates to matters of form.

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.


In view of the above remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsideration the various rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in connection with the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305), at the telephone number of the undersigned in order to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439


DRA/JWR/kpc

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000